



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/197,184	11/20/1998	KOSEI TERADA	25484.000691	1001

25224 7590 05/05/2003
MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP
555 WEST FIFTH STREET
SUITE 3500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013-1024

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/197,184

Applicant(s)

TERADA ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 31 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-22.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Sato and Ohba do not disclose or suggest providing musical control information and providing a parameter setting module whereby the user can select one of multiple types of event data to control a movable part of an animated object since the multiple types of event data are MIDI data whereas the multiple types of event data in the references are not. Examiner disagrees. The MIDI event data is not claimed. Instead, the multiple types of event data are claimed, which are interpreted as any types of event data as in the rejections. Applicants also argue that the techniques of Ohba and the invention are completely different since the claims recite selecting and setting types of event data such as note-on data, which indicate a specific type of event that causes the tone generator to generate a sound differently. Ohba, on the other hand, discloses using a filter to detect the musical characteristics of the sound already synthesized based on MIDI data. Examiner does not agree. First, the feature "the type of event data such as note-on data, which indicate a specific type of event that causes the tone generator to generate a sound differently" is not claimed as argued. Second, the event data of the invention is the note-on data, which is based on the MIDI data, where the note-on data is known as a sound already synthesized. Ohba applies MIDI data. The fact that Ohba uses a filter to detect the musical characteristics of a sound already synthesized based on MIDI data suggests that Ohba selects a synthesized sound based on a condition via the filter. The invention has the feature of selecting and setting types of event data where the data are also synthesized sound. Therefore, there is no much difference between the two techniques.